



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/759,409	01/16/2004	Luciano M. Silva	RSW920030258US1 (140)	7485
46320 7590 09/04/2007 CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP STEVEN M. GREENBERG 950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE SUITE 3020 BOCA RATON, FL 33487			EXAMINER PARK, JEONG S	
			ART UNIT 2154	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/04/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/759,409	Applicant(s) SILVA, LUCIANO M.	
	Examiner Jeong S. Park	Art Unit 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/16/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 8-15 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 8, line 9, the phrase "in said set" should be corrected as --in said set of roles-- for clear understanding of the claim. Similar correction should be made for claim 12; and

In claim 9, line 2, the phrase "said to a set of roles" should be corrected as --said role to said set of roles-- for clear understanding of the claim. Similar correction should be made for claim 13.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Independent claim 1 is drawn towards a server page comprising at least one markup language fragment defining a user interface, an additional markup language fragment defining a link and a custom tag including said additional markup language fragment. This is just an abstract idea cab be written in a computer programming code. In order for an abstract claim to be statutory, it must result in useful, concrete, and tangible results. The final result achieved by the claimed invention does not produce any tangible result.

Claims 2 and 3, which are dependent on claim 1, do not add any tangible results to the claim and thus are rejected for the same.

Independent claim 4 is drawn towards a system comprising an application framework, a first view and access checking logic to omit a linkage. This is just an abstract idea can be written in a computer programming code. In order for an abstract claim to be statutory, it must result in useful, concrete, and tangible results. The final result achieved by the claimed invention does not produce any tangible result.

Claims 5-7, which are dependent on claim 4, do not add any tangible results to the claim and thus are rejected for the same.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bazinet et al. (hereinafter Bazinet)(U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0167298 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Bazinet teaches as follows:

a server page (Web pages) configured for processing by a server page engine (portal server 100 in figure 1)(Web pages sent by the portal server, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0026], lines 10-17), the server page comprising:

at least one markup language fragment (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0026], lines 12-16) defining a user interface for a first view (authentication information received from the client include a user name and password combination, see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0037], lines 5-11, based on this user information the portal application 502 in figure 5 shows the identified user, see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0039]);

an additional markup language (HTML, see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0041]) fragment defining a link to a second view (the second view is interpreted as a page leading to the backend applications in backend system 118, 120 and 122 in figure 1)(the portal application, 102 in figure 1 and 502 in figure 5, generates a page to the client containing entries corresponding to the backend applications, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0038]);

a custom tag (instructions 506 in figure 5, see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0039]) conditionally including said additional markup language fragment only if a role detected for an end user attempting to access the first view also has been defined in a deployment descriptor (portal generic objects database, 203 in figure 2, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0030]) as an authorized role for accessing said second view (the first Web page shows the instruction tag for users to select eligible applications based on the access privileges of the authenticated user, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0030] and [0038]); and

the first view provides a Web page for a secure session between the client and the portal server and the second view provides another Web page for a connection between the client and the backend system only for the authenticated user based on the

Art Unit: 2154

access privileges of the authenticated user, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0037] and [0038]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bazinet et al. (hereinafter Bazinet)(U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0167298 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Schenk (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0004887 A1).

Regarding claims 2 and 3, Bazinet teaches as follows:

said first and second views (Web pages) are Java server pages (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0026], lines 10-17); and

deployment descriptor (portal generic objects database, 203 in figure 2, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0030]) is a configuration file for an application framework (Web page sent to the client in JSP) incorporating said JSPs (the Web page is configured based on the portal generic object database, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0038]).

Bazinet does not explicitly teach using Struts framework as the application framework incorporating the JSPs.

Schenk teaches as follows:

a configuration file is used to configure the presentation of an object (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0015]); and

Java server pages can be generated with Struts framework, as open source framework of utilizing pre-stored design patterns (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0017], lines 15-19).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bazinet to include Struts framework as an application framework incorporating the JSPs as taught by Schenk in order to facilitate the development of JSPs applications.

8. Claims 4 and 6-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bazinet et al. (hereinafter Bazinet)(U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0167298 A1), and further in view of Vasandani et al. (hereinafter Vasandani)(U.S. Patent No. 6,985,946 B1).

Regarding claim 4, Bazinet teaches as follows:

a system for programmatic role-based security in a dynamically generated user interface, the system comprising:

an application framework configured through a deployment descriptor (portal generic objects database) comprising a listing of a set of views (n generic objects 204 in figure 2, each object creates different view), a listing of associated program logic (based on the access privileges of the authenticated user the database lists different access level) and a listing of a set of authorized actions (read, read/write, or no access, 208 in figure 2, indicates the roles) for selected ones of said views (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0030]);

a first view (502 in figure 5) listed in said deployment descriptor (portal generic objects database) and comprising a linkage to a second view (linkage to the backend

applications 126 in figure 1) listed in said deployment descriptor (the portal application generates a page to the client containing entries corresponding to the backend applications that the authenticated user can access based on the access privileges of the authenticated user, see, e.g., page 3, paragraphs [0038] and figure 5); and

access checking logic disposed in said first view and programmed to omit said linkage (no access) where a role of an end user accessing said first view is not authorized to access said second view according to said listing of said set of authorized roles in said deployment descriptor (the instructions, 506 in figure 5, only shows what are authorized to the client, see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0040] and figure 5).

Bazinet does not teach the security control by user roles.

Vasandani teaches as follows:

providing role based access security within a networked computing system (see, e.g., col. 2, lines 40-43); and

the method for providing an authentication and authorization pipeline having a userID-roles database and a resource-roles database for use in a web server to grant access to web resources to users (see, e.g., col. 2, line 58 to col. 3, line 9).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bazinet to include the method of role based security access as taught by Vasandani in order to efficiently control security access by the user's roles predefined.

Regarding claim 6, Bazinet teaches as follows:

said program logic comprises servlets and wherein said views comprise Java

server pages (the Web page sent by the portal server to the clients may include Java server pages, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0026], lines 12-17).

Regarding claim 7, Bazinet teaches as follows:

a custom tag (instructions 506 in figure 5, see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0039]) disposed in said first view for invoking said access checking logic and for omitting said linkage responsive to said access checking logic (the first Web page shows the instruction tag for users to select eligible applications based on the access privileges of the authenticated user, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0030] and [0038]).

Regarding claim 8 and 12, Bazinet teaches as follows:

a method for programmatic user privilege based security in a dynamically generated user interface (see, e.g., abstract), the method comprising the steps of:

authenticating access to a rendering of a selected view based upon an end user's privileges (access privileges of the authenticated user) requesting access to said selected view (see, e.g., step 414 in figure 4 and page 3, paragraph [0037]);

processing said selected view to identify a method call to access checking logic (see, e.g., steps 422-434 in figure 4 and page 4, paragraphs [0042]-[0044]); and

disposing a link to said different view in said rendering of said selected view if user's privilege matches the privilege stored in the portal generic objects database (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0038] and step 416 in figure 4).

Bazinet does not teach role based security access and following steps of using it but all limitations with user's privilege based security access.

Vasandani teaches as follows:

providing role based access security within a networked computing system (see, e.g., col. 2, lines 40-43);

the method for providing an authentication and authorization pipeline having a userID-roles database and a resource-roles database for use in a web server to grant access to web resources to users (see, e.g., col. 2, line 58 to col. 3, line 9); and

comparing said role (userID-roles object, 211 in figure 4) to a set of roles (roles/access database, 422 in figure 4) authorized to access a different view (requested resource) associated with said access checking logic (the roles authorization module retrieves the database entry for the requested resource using the URI and attempts to match a role from the userID-roles object with the roles in the roles/access database entry, see, e.g., col. 8, lines 1-4).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bazinet to include the method of role based security access as taught by Vasandani in order to efficiently control security access by the user's roles predefined.

Regarding claims 9-11 and 13-15, Vasandani teaches as follows:

said step of authenticating comprises the step of comparing said role (userID-roles object, 211 in figure 4) to a set of roles (roles/access database, 422 in figure 4) associated with said selected view to locate a match for said role (the roles authorization module retrieves the database entry for the requested resource using the URI and attempts to match a role from the userID-roles object with the roles in the roles/access database entry, see, e.g., col. 8, lines 1-4);

said locating step comprises the step of parsing a deployment descriptor (roles/access database, 422 in figure 4) for an application framework hosting said selected view and said different view to identify said set of roles (this is inherent process for authorization module 202 in figure 4, see, e.g., col. 7, line 53 to col. 8, line 11); and

said processing step comprises the step of invoking external access checking logic for a located server page tag referencing said access checking logic (this is inherent process for authorization module 202 in figure 4, see, e.g., col. 7, line 53 to col. 8, line 11).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bazinet to include the method of role based security access as taught by Vasandani in order to efficiently control security access by the user's roles predefined.

Regarding claim 16, Bazinet teaches as follows:

A method for programmatic user privilege based security in a dynamically generated user interface (see, e.g., abstract), the method comprising the steps of:

configuring a deployment descriptor (portal generic objects database, 203 in figure 2)(populating a portal generic object database, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0032]); and

composing a server page to include a reference to said external access checking logic and to invoke said external access in order to conditionally incorporate a link to a specific view associated with a specific set of authorized roles (the portal application, 102 in figure 1 and 502 in figure 5, generates a page to the client containing entries

corresponding to the backend applications, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0038]).

Vasandani teaches as follows:

providing role based access security within a networked computing system (see, e.g., col. 2, lines 40-43);

the method for providing an authentication and authorization pipeline having a userID-roles database and a resource-roles database for use in a web server to grant access to web resources to users (see, e.g., col. 2, line 58 to col. 3, line 9); and

programming external access checking logic to match a parameterized role (userID-roles object, 211 in figure 4) with a role disposed in said set of roles in said deployment descriptor (roles/access database, 422 in figure 4)(the roles authorization module retrieves the database entry for the requested resource using the URI and attempts to match a role from the userID-roles object with the roles in the roles/access database entry, see, e.g., col. 8, lines 1-4).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bazinet to include the method of role based security access as taught by Vasandani in order to efficiently control security access by the user's roles predefined.

9. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bazinet et al. (hereinafter Bazinet)(U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0167298 A1) and Vasandani et al. (hereinafter Vasandani)(U.S. Patent No. 6,985,946 B1) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Schenk (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0004887 A1).

Regarding claim 5, Bazinet and Vasandani teach all the limitations of claim 4 as

Art Unit: 2154

explained above except for using Struts framework as the application framework incorporating the JSPs.

Schenk teaches as follows:

a configuration file is used to configure the presentation of an object (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0015]); and

Java server pages can be generated with Struts framework, as open source framework of utilizing pre-stored design patterns (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0017], lines 15-19).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bazinet and Vasandani to include Struts framework as an application framework incorporating the JSPs as taught by Schenk in order to facilitate the development of JSPs applications.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeong S. Park whose telephone number is 571-270-1597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 7:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Art Unit: 2154

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.


Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system,

call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Supriya D. NATHAN FLYNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

JP

August 22, 2007